



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

NOV 24 2003

GROUP 360

In Re Application of:

Trpkovski

Examiner: Tran A, Phi Dieu N

Group Art Unit: 3637

Serial No.: 10/076,211

Attorney Docket: 44046.103.203.21.2

Filed: 12 February 2002

Assignee: Cardinal IG Company

For: IMPROVED MASKING FOR
INSULATING GLASS UNITS,
MONOLITHIC PANES, AND OTHER
SUBSTRATES

) I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

) ☒ deposited with the United States Postal
) Service as first-class mail in an envelope
) addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O.
) Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

☐ facsimile transmitted to the Patent and
Trademark Office

☐ hand delivered to the Patent and Trademark
Office

To: Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on this 10th day of November, 2003

By Eric J. Snustad

Eric J. Snustad

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant's representative would like to thank Examiner Tran A for extending him the courtesy of a personal interview on 28 October 2003 to discuss this case. The following recordation of the substance of the interview is believed to be complete and proper, as required by MPEP 713.04. It is requested that the Examiner notify the undersigned if the Examiner believes this Interview Summary contains any material inaccuracies or if the Examiner believes this Summary is otherwise not complete and proper.

Interview participants: (1) Examiner Tran A; and (2) Applicant's attorney, Eric J. Snustad

No exhibit was shown, and no demonstration was conducted, during the interview.

Claims 1, 13, and 48 were discussed during the interview.

The following prior art was discussed during the interview: (1) U.S. Patent 5,735,089 (Smith et al.); (2) U.S. Patent 5,866,260 (Adams, Jr. et al.); and (3) U.S. Patent Application Publication U.S. 2003/0070391A1 (Tachauer et al.).

No agreement was reached during the interview.

Following are alternative amendments that were discussed during the interview (It is emphasized that these alternatives were only proposed to advance prosecution of the present case by obtaining prompt allowance of claims covering certain preferred embodiments. Applicant contends vigorously that the original claims are patentably distinct over the cited prior art, and Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims in further prosecution):

The Examiner and the undersigned discussed the possibility, with respect to claim 1, to indicate that the masking material allows visual inspection of the masked pane;

The Examiner and the undersigned discussed the possibility, with respect to claim 1, to indicate that the strips are disposed in an overlapping fashion, and that the strips are parallel to one another and have the same length;

The Examiner and the undersigned discussed the possibility, with respect to claim 1, to indicate that the strips are disposed in an overlapping fashion, and that the overlapped strips are affixed to one another by being adhesively joined;

The Examiner and the undersigned discussed the possibility, with respect to claim 1, to indicate that the strips are disposed in an overlapping fashion such that the overlapped strips define a plurality of exposed lateral edges;

The Examiner and the undersigned discussed the possibility, with respect to claim 1, to indicate that the pane is mounted in a frame that retains the pane in a vertical position, and that the strips are positioned such that their lengths extend vertically along the pane;

The Examiner and the undersigned discussed the possibility, with respect to claim 13, to indicate that the masking material is a film; and

The Examiner and the undersigned discussed the possibility, with respect to claim 48, to indicate that the assembly includes glazing compound between the frame and the pane, and that the masking material extends beneath the frame but no so far as to engage the glazing compound.

The general thrust of the principal arguments made was that the cited references fail to disclose either a pane masked with multiple strips or a pane carrying masking material adapted to extend beneath a frame, and that the discussed claim alternatives cover certain preferred embodiments that define even more clearly over the cited prior art.

No other pertinent matters were discussed during the interview.

Dated: 10 November 2003

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Snustad
Registration No. 45,120
Fredrikson & Byron, P.A.
4000 Pillsbury Center
200 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 492-7151

#2884329\1